

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2010.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2010, Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-84 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628, hereinafter Anuff) in view of Abel, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0084401, hereinafter Abel). Claim 84 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, in view of Abel and further in view of Saulpaugh, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,548,946, hereinafter Saulpaugh).

### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 59, 83-84, cancels Claims 13, 72, 81-82, and adds new Claim 85, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-12, 14-15, 17-20, 59-71, 73-74, 76-79 and 83-85.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff in view of Abel. Claim 84 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff in view of Abel and further in view of Saulpaugh.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite as following.

1. (Currently Amended) *A method for rendering a portal graphical user interface (GUI) for a portal, comprising:*

*providing a set of controls, wherein the set of controls can be organized in a logical hierarchy, wherein each said control represents a corresponding graphical element in the portal GUI, wherein each said control has properties that can be read and set, wherein each said control is implemented as one or more classes in an object-oriented programming paradigm, wherein each said control has one or more methods which can be overridden to provide specialization of each said control;*

*traversing, using at least one processor, the logical hierarchy, wherein the traversing comprises:*

*associating a first theme with a first control in the set of controls;*

*associating descendants of the first control according to the first theme unless the theme is overridden;*

*overriding a second control, which is a descendent of the first control, with a second theme such that the second control uses the second theme and any descendent of the second control uses the second theme unless the second theme is overridden;*

*using a first thread to render the first control according to the first theme, and a second thread to render the second control according to the second theme, wherein the rendering of the first control by the first thread is in parallel to the rendering of the second control by the second thread; and*

*after the first thread finishes rendering the first control according to the first theme and the second thread finishes rendering the second control according to the second theme, using a mainline render to obtain rendering result for the first control from the first thread and render result for the second control from the second thread.*

Anuff discloses a portal server that comprises a plurality of modules in a pre-determined format (Abstract). Anuff further discloses that a user can view different types of information at once through a browser (Column 3, Lines 28-32).

However, as stated in the pending Office Action, Anuff does not disclose rendering the first control according to the first theme in parallel with rendering the second control according to the second theme.

Abel discloses that a web page is localized based on a selected characteristics (Abstract). Abel further discloses that the instance of the LocalizedPage class overrides the standard Render method of the standard ASP.NET page class with a special Render method.

However, there is also no indication in Abel that the rendering of the instance of the LocalizedPage class is by a first thread, and the rendering of the standard ASP.NET page class is by a second thread. Additionally, there is no indication in Abel that descendants of the instance of the LocalizedPage class uses the special Render method unless it is overridden.

Applicant also respectfully submits that the cited references do not appear to disclose or render obvious the above features. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite these features.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claim 59**

The comments provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Claim 59 have been amended similarly to Claim 1 to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 59, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claim 84**

Claim 84 depends from Claim 1, and The comments provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Additionally, Claim 84 has been amended to recite as following.

*84. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising:  
allowing the first thread that renders the first control to interact with the second  
thread that renders the second control through an event notification mechanism.*

As stated in the pending Office Action, Anuff and Abel do not disclose that at least one said control can interact with another said control through an event notification mechanism.

Saulpaugh discloses a message gate that is a message endpoint for a client or service to communicate with another client or service (Abstract). Saulpaugh further discloses that the message gate provides a mechanism to restrict message flow between clients and services and the messages includes event notification message (Column 17-18, Lines 63-23).

However, there is no indication in Saulpaugh that the message gate represents a corresponding graphical and functional element in the portal GUI. There is no indication in Saulpaugh that the event notification message is from another control in the same portal GUI. Additionally, there is indication in Saulpaugh that the event notification allows different thread to interact.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 84, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 2-12, 14-15, 17-20, 60-71, 73-74, 76-79 and 83-85**

Claims 2-12, 14-15, 17-20, 60-71, 73-74, 76-79 and 83-85 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1 or 59. Claims 2-12, 14-15, 17-20, 60-71, 73-74, 76-79 and 83-85 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**IV. Additional Amendments**

Claim 85 has been newly added by the present Reply. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claim 85 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 26, 2010

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/  
Kuiran (Ted) Liu  
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 80548  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Fax: (415) 362-2928